



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,188	10/26/2005	Jean-Yves Fortin	ALCN-117US	8488
23122	7590	10/09/2008	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			LIN, KUANG Y	
P O BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			PAPER NUMBER	
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			10/09/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/532,188

Applicant(s)

FORTIN ET AL.

Examiner

Kuang Y. Lin

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17 and 24-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/21/05 & 11/13/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Applicant in response to the restriction requirement elected Group I, Species II of the invention without traverse. Per the telephone conversation on October 7, 2008, between applicant's attorney, Mr. Spadt, and examiner Lin, it was confirmed that claims 19-23 shall depend from claim 18, rather than claim 1. Accordingly, claims 19-23 along with claim 18 belong to elected Species II and non-elected claims 1-17 and 12-33 stand withdrawn from further consideration.

2. Applicant in response to this office action is reminded to amend claims 19-23 to depend from claim 18.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either US 2003/192627 to Lee et al. or US 6,592,687 to Lee et al.

Both prior art references show to make an aluminum-boron composite article (see, for example, [0020], [0034] and [0037] in '627 and col. 3, lines 44+, col. 6, lines 42+ and col. 7, lines 13+ of '687). Although the Ti is in the range of 0.05-1.2, it would have been to limit the amount of Ti more than 0.2 % to strengthen the aluminum alloy matrix if a stronger aluminum-boron carbide composite were designated. With respect to claims 19-23, those claimed features are deemed to be conventional process for forming a cast article to a final product.

6. Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teaching of US 2003/0179846 to Murakami et al. and US 4,786,467 to Skibo et al.

Murakami et al. show to form an aluminum-boron carbide composite through a powder metallurgical process. The boron carbide is in an amount of 1.5 to 9 weight % of the composite which equal to about 3.75-22.5 volume % of the composite. The composite further incorporates 0.2-4 weight % of titanium to improve the strength of the composite (see, for example, [0022], [0069] and [0070]). Skibo et al. show to form an aluminum-boron carbide composite (see

col. 9, 2nd paragraph) by first mixing the boron carbide into the molten aluminum and after the mixing is complete, the mixture is then cast into a cast article through any conventional casting process. The cast article can be further process by extruding or rolling to a final product (see, col. 11, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs). Since the powder metallurgical process involving powder making, mixing, sintering, etc. steps, it would have been obvious to use the casting process of Skibo et al. for forming the aluminum-boron carbide composite of Murakami et al. to simplify the process and thereby reduce the production cost. It would also have been obvious to alloy aluminum with titanium in the process of Skibo et al. to improve the strength of the composite article in view of Murakami et al.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-1179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica L. Ward can be reached on 571-272-1223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kuang Y. Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

10-7-08